

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the application. The Examiner has allowed claims 1-30 and 43-48. The Examiner has rejected claims 31-42. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-48.

The Examiner has rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Aoyagi, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0032761). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 31, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate the subject matter of claim 31. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to anticipate "a display device comprising a discovery range window for displaying a network address range for discovery of network devices and a discovered devices window for displaying identification information for devices discovered within said network address range, said devices providing routing capabilities." While the Examiner cites "(graphical user interface GUI for displaying a range of network addresses for discovery of network devices, elements 3601, 3603, 3604, Fig. 36)," Applicant does not see disclosure as to "...a network address range..." in the cited portion of the cited reference. Rather, element 3601 is described as a "Network Map," which does not appear to disclose "...a network address range...", reference 3603 merely denotes highlighting (col. 16, lines 5 and 6) and does not appear to disclose "...a network address range...", and non-intelligent hub 3604 (col. 16, line 10) does not appear to disclose "...a network address range...." Therefore, Applicant submits a *prima facie* showing of anticipation has not been made with respect to the subject matter of claim 31. Thus, Applicant submits claim 31 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 32-35 and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Aoyagi et al. (US Publication 2002/0032761), in view of Singer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,298). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 32, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 32. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose "a user interface for accepting input from a user, said user interface comprising means for said user to specify said discovery range." While the Examiner cites, "(col. 15, lines 10-19 and Fig. 19E)" of the Singer reference, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits the cited portion of the cited reference fails to disclose and teaches away

from the subject matter of claim 32, for example, "...means for said user to specify said discovery range." Rather, col. 15, lines 13-15, state, "...buttons 5070 and 5072 allowing particular functions to be performed (i.e., remove or remove all of the selected ranges)." Thus, Applicant submits claim 32 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 33, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 33. Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claims from which claim 33 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 33 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 34, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 34. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "a network communications system for sending network communications to each network address in said discovery range and for receiving responses from any network address in said discovery range." While the Examiner states, "Singer discloses Auto-Discovery Service (network communication system) where it sends 'ping' (network communications) to the IP address range when searching the IP address range for network devices (col. 5, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-8 and Fig. 4)," Applicant submits the Examiner does not allege teaching or suggestion as to "...and for receiving responses from any network address in said discovery range." Therefore, Applicant submits the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claim 34. Thus, Applicant submits claim 34 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 35, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 35. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein said range comprises a plurality of contiguous network addresses." While the Examiner cites "(a plurality of contiguous IP addresses, see Fig. 46a)" in the Aoyagi reference, Applicant notes Fig. 46a appears not to disclose values for the expressions "xxx." Thus, Applicant submits the cited portion of the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 37, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 37. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "a message response analyzer for

analyzing responses received from network addresses in said discovery range." While the Examiner cites "(analyzing network device information display areas 3601, 3602, see paragraph 0339, Fig. 36)," Applicant notes paragraph [0339] of the Aoyagi reference describes the features of Fig. 36 using verbs such as "is displayed," not "analyzing." Therefore, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 37. Thus, Applicant submits claim 37 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 38, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 38. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein said message response analyzer comprises identification means for identifying a type of a device sending a response." While the Examiner cites "(network map area 3601 in the network configuration of chart display, identifies whether the device is a type of router or non-intelligent hub, see Fig. 36)," Applicant submits Fig. 36 is entitled an "Example of Network Configuration Chart Display." Accordingly, it appears to disclose a "Network Configuration Chart Display," not a "message response analyzer" "wherein said message response analyzer comprises identification means...." Thus, Applicant submits claim 38 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 39, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 39. Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claims from which claim 39 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 39 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 40, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 40. Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claims from which claim 40 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 40 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 41, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 41. Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims from which claim 41 depends. Thus, Applicant submits claim 41 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 42, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render unpatentable the subject matter of claim 42. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein said discovered devices window comprises information identifying a discovered device's type." While the Examiner cites "(network map area 3601 in the network configuration of chart display, which identifies the device is of type router, see element 3601, Fig. 36 and paragraph 0445)," Applicant notes "ori-irouter.ori.xxx.co.jp" appears to be a subdomain name, not information identifying a discovered device's type." For example, a network intrusion detection scheme might misdescriptively assign subdomain names to lure hackers to a "honeypot" to detect unauthorized access. Accordingly, a subdomain name cannot be trusted as identifying a device's type. Thus, Applicant submits claim 42 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoyagi et al. in view of Singer, and in further view of Bearden et al. (USP 6,917,626). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes the Bearden et al. reference is U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0097438 A1, while USP 6,917,626 corresponds to the Duvvury reference. Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has not uniquely identified the references upon which the Examiner purports to reject claim 36. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 36 is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 36. As one example, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein said range comprises a plurality of discreet, non-contiguous network addresses." While the Examiner cites "(see paragraphs 0012, 0013, 0014)" of the Bearden reference as allegedly disclosing network devices with IP addresses that belong to another subnet, Applicant submits teaching in the Bearden reference as to subnets does not necessarily disclose or suggest "...a plurality of discreet, non-contiguous network addresses." Rather, multiple subnets could be assigned addresses that are not "discreet, non-contiguous network addresses." Thus, Applicant submits claim 36 is in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

03/06/2008

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.  
PO Box 164075  
Austin, Texas 78716-4075  
(512) 347-9223 (phone)  
(512) 347-9224 (fax)

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

20

Application Number

10/029,124

Filing Date

12-19-2001

First Named Inventor

Moise Gaspard, et al.

Art Unit

2616

Examiner Name

Mew, Kevin D

Attorney Docket Number

1400.1374870

**ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)**

Fee Transmittal Form



Fee Attached



Amendment/Reply



After Final



Affidavits/declaration(s)



Extension of Time Request



Express Abandonment Request



Information Disclosure Statement



Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

Reply to Missing Parts/  
Incomplete ApplicationReply to Missing Parts  
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

Drawing(s)



Licensing-related Papers



Petition

Petition to Convert to a  
Provisional Application

Power of Attorney, Revocation



Change of Correspondence Address



Terminal Disclaimer



Request for Refund



CD, Number of CD(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Landscape Table on CD



Remarks



After Allowance Communication to TC

Appeal Communication to Board  
of Appeals and InterferencesAppeal Communication to TC  
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)

Proprietary Information



Status Letter

Other Enclosure(s) (please identify  
below):

Return Receipt Postcard

**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm Name

Ross D. Snyder &amp; Associates, Inc.

Signature

Printed name

Ross D. Snyder

Date

03-06-2008

Reg. No.

37,730

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730

Date

03-06-2008

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.